

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9167

Wallace customarily arose at 5 a.m. to do the chores on his 188-acre farm, tending his poultry and taking milk from his Jersey herd into town before going to his office.

At a meeting of the Izaak Walton League of America, which he had served as national president, he once said in an attack on stream pollution:

"A nation's economic strength and therefore its military strength is related to its use of land and water."

BORN AT HURRICANE

"Among the reasons for perpetuating land and streams is that every generation of boys and young men is entitled to the natural sports of preceding generations. But the Izaak Walton League's standing declaration of its aims is broader than that, and should be known by everyone who mistakes it for a fisherman's club."

His enthusiasm for conservation extended to nature's humblest creatures. He once stopped his car on a busy highway to help a turtle cross the road.

Named for Wallace are Tom Wallace Lake, in the Jefferson County Forest, and the Tom Wallace chapter of the Izaak Walton League.

Wallace was born November 26, 1874, at Hurricane, Crittenden County, Ky. He was the son of Tom and Mrs. Mary Stuart Dade Wallace.

Much of his early education was by tutors, but he also attended Sampson's Academy, Shelbyville; Weaver's Business College, Louisville, and Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, Va.

He married Miss Augusta French, Philadelphia, on February 23, 1910.

Mrs. Wallace died March 30. She was the daughter of Harry B. French, one of the partners in the pharmaceutical firm of Smith, Kilne & French Laboratories.

Wallace is survived by a son, Henry F. Wallace, Prospect, formerly a Time magazine correspondent in Cuba; a daughter, Mrs. Edward Lyons, New York, and five grandchildren. Mrs. Lyons was a member of the Louisville Times editorial staff from World War II until April 1950.

The University of Louisville gave Wallace an honorary degree of master of fine arts in 1937. Two years ago he received the honorary degree of doctor of letters from the University of Kentucky.

He also received an honorary degree of doctor of laws from Cumberland University, Lebanon, Tenn., in 1942.

HELD MANY POSTS

In 1940-41 he was president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. He was for several years president of the University of Louisville's International Center.

Wallace also had been an honorary vice president of the American Forestry Association, president of the Southern Forestry Congress, and secretary and vice president of the American Planning and Civic Association.

He served as a director of the Izaak Walton League, vice president of Natural Bridge State Park Association, executive board member of Mammoth Cave National Park Association, and board chairman of the National Conference on State Parks.

FOUNDED CONFERENCE

Wallace founded the Ohio Valley Regional Conference on State Parks. He was a former adviser to the National Park Service and an honorary member of the American Institute of Park Executives and the American Society of Landscape Architects.

He received awards for his conservation efforts from the Woodmen of the World, Sportsman's Club of America, and the U.S. Department of the Interior.

The Courier-Journal, the Louisville Times, and WHAS established the Tom Wallace soil and water, forest, and wildlife conservation contest in his honor.

No. 96—12

GAVE GOOD ADVICE

Wallace belonged to the Arts Club, Filson Club, Louisville Country Club, and Kappa Sigma Fraternity. He was an honorary life member of the Kentucky Ornithological Society and an associate of the American Ornithologists Union.

The editor's older associates remember him for his helpfulness and sound advice to young newspapermen.

A novice reporter, interviewing him about one of his activities, pulled out a wad of copy paper and tried to record every word Wallace was saying.

"Don't do that," Wallace advised mildly. "You're writing instead of listening. If you'll just pay attention, you won't need any notes."

VIEWS HARD HITTING

The editorial page he conducted reflected his belief in short, hard-hitting discussions of events. He once told the Indiana University Journalism Conference:

"An editorial page without spunk is bunk. An editor can't be valiant in print and a valet at heart."

He also told them:

"When, or if, free speech, of which the editorial page is the symbol and the soul, is impinged upon ever so slightly by legislative processes, the lifeblood of democracy will begin to flow from the heart toward the earth."

A frequent speaker at conventions and other gatherings, Wallace was known for his succinct style of stating his beliefs.

The Democratic Women's Clubs of Kentucky once voted that Wallace "should never again be invited" to address the group. An independent in politics, he had said in a speech to the group that persons who are too party-bound injure their own party. The women later retracted their action.

SOME COLUMNISTS STINK

A believer in the obligation of the press to serve the people, he gave this opinion to a press group in Washington a few years ago: "Some columnists serve the public and the press and some stink, and that is equally true of editors."

Wallace felt deeply about the newspaper's role as the watchdog—or alarm clock, as he put it—of society.

This is what he said to the students at Eastern Kentucky State College in June 1929:

"A few of us who are not seeking political office, are not obliged to consider what this or that corporation might say, insist upon speaking aloud in behalf of the generation and future generations on certain aspects and assets of Kentucky."

FUNCTION TO SOCIETY STATED

"By so doing, we hope to perform the function of one of the most disliked but most useful pieces of mechanism in the list of modern conveniences, the alarm clock."

One of Wallace's criteria for a successful editorial: "It should be no longer than a pencil."

Wallace retained his interest in contemporary affairs to the end. And retirement as editor was not really retirement for him, because until his final illness in 1959 he wrote a thrice-weekly column for the Times editorial page on a wide variety of subjects.

CUBANS FOR TRACTORS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, my opposition and concern in connection with the so-called Cubans-for-tractors deal has been expressed several times on the floor of the Senate, and is generally known. But it seems to me this matter is now developing serious ramifications, even beyond those first envisioned; and

certainly these developments vindicate the good judgment of our predecessors in Congress who enacted the Logan Act.

In the first place, we have all read in the newspapers that a Castro cable was sent to Walter Reuther. I suppose we should refer to him now as de facto Secretary of State Walter Reuther, since he is head of this new volunteer department of state which has been negotiating with Castro. There originally seemed to be some reluctance on his part to share with his fellow Americans the contents of the message he received. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD—from the New York Times—what is said to be the unofficial context of the communication.

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF PREMIER CASTRO'S MESSAGE ACCEPTING TRACTORS FOR PRISONERS

(HAVANA, June 7.—Following, in an unofficial translation, is the text of the message sent by Premier Fidel Castro last night to the United States Tractors for Freedom Committee.)

With all respect I want to tell you the following:

This committee has not taken any practical steps to carry the negotiations to a positive and immediate result.

The delay in the negotiations is only useful to those who need this time to carry out against Cuba a campaign as hypocritical and hateful as the rest of the criminal proceedings against our fatherland that have been carried out by forces organized, equipped, and managed by the Government of the United States.

The Revolutionary Government (of Cuba) has expressed with complete clarity its points of view about the question, while those who should have been the most interested in repairing their grave violations of international law and morality, and their great political and practical errors that led the United States into one of the most disgraceful episodes of its history, have only been zigzagging, pretending, and indulging in ambiguities.

UNITED STATES HELD RESPONSIBLE

The responsibility of the Government of the United States for the invasion of Cuba and for the deaths and destruction that it caused in our country is thoroughly known by world public opinion and recognized by the authors of the aggression themselves.

The only way to have avoided this embarrassing situation would have been respect for the sovereignty and integrity of our country, in conformity with the law of nations, large or small, and universal morality.

Cuba does not bear the blame, but only and exclusively the United States, for the maddening situation and the discredit that its policy of aggression against Cuba has created. It is also to blame for the fate of its mercenaries who launched themselves on an illegal and immoral adventure against Cuba.

Cuba has the right to impose exemplary sanctions on those who committed, against their own country, the crime of high treason, from the moment they acted under the orders of a foreign government, as the President of the United States himself has confessed.

It would be a grave error to interpret the gesture of Cuba toward liberating these prisoners except those responsible for previous crimes—with the sole condition that material damages be indemnified—as weakness, inhumanity, or negotiations of a material type.

WOULD RENOUNCE INDEMNITY

The Government of Cuba has indicated willingness to renounce all material indemnity if the U.S. Government will free, and ask its allies to free, an equal number of North American, Spanish, Nicaraguan, Guatemalan and Puerto Rican patriots who are jailed for fighting against fascism, racialism, colonialism, tyranny and imperialism. These allies are Francisco Franco of Spain, Luis Somoza, of Nicaragua, Miguel Ydigoras, of Guatemala, and Muñoz-Marín, of Puerto Rico, the last three being accomplices in the aggression against Cuba.

Neither the Government of the United States nor this committee has deigned to say a single word about the possibility of this real exchange—liberty for liberty—while, on the other hand, Cuba is willing to renounce all material indemnity if the United States and its partners are willing to renounce the desire to keep in jail Pedro Albizu Campos, Henry Winston, and other true patriots. They would be exchanged for an equal number of invaders who, in the inglorious and treasonable role of soldiers of exploiting monopolies, attacked their country with the escort of ships and planes of the powerful United States.

Your committee knows exactly the type and amount of the material indemnity Cuba asks, since this was given to you in detail by the delegation of prisoners. The Government of Cuba will adhere strictly to this without entering into a shopkeeper type of haggling.

It has become known that in the aggression against Cuba the Central Intelligence Agency invested \$45 million, while the U.S. Treasury did not skimp a cent that would serve to destroy the lives of Cuban men, women, and children and cause great material damage to our country—which permits us to call ridiculous and disgraceful the attitude of those who oppose an indemnity for the material damages.

The raising and negotiation of this problem cannot be made only by cablegram, and it is better that a delegation should be sent to Cuba. In this there should be one of the principal members of the committee, preferably Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt or Milton Eisenhower, whose names, because they are better known in political spheres, would contribute to the solution of the matter.

If the committee is in the honorable position of being willing to mediate in this problem, without hesitation or timidity, it should send the delegation, which has been mentioned in previous communications, to deal with the Cuban Government either on the payment of the indemnity or the question of liberating an equal number of North American, Spanish, Nicaraguan, Guatemalan, and Puerto Rican prisoners.

Is the committee perhaps afraid to discuss the liberty of other men jailed for political motives in the United States, Spain, Nicaragua, Guatemala or Puerto Rico? Does not this type of case appear doubly humane?

The Cuban Government states with all clarity that in making these suggestions it is not following underhanded political aims and that it will not desist from its generous attitude.

Permit me to express to the members of the committee our thanks for its reiterated affirmations that it is acting on motives of human interest to demonstrate its friendship to the Cuban people.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am sure that those who read the purported contents of the cable will find it to be both contemptuous and insulting—the kind of communication we might expect, I suppose, from such a Communist dictator to send to a volunteer committee attempting to negotiate with him.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I think Americans are entitled to know, at the time when an answer to that communication from Castro is sent, the complete contents of the answer. It is bad enough to have private citizens negotiating with foreign governments on international policy. To conduct such negotiations in secret would be indefensible.

I should like to point out that the next step in this sorry blackmail attempt is, we now find, that Castro has dictated the names of certain Americans with whom he has said he would be willing to talk.

Mr. President, since this sorry business has become official, and since the President has endorsed it and has said perhaps he can obtain the tax exemption which the committee desires, I believe the time has come when this matter should be made a matter of official U.S. policy and should be dealt with through the official U.S. diplomatic procedure, through our regular official diplomatic channels as provided by the Swiss Government in Havana. In my opinion, we should no longer permit having private individuals negotiate in so nonsensical a manner with the Cuban dictator who is attempting to subject our country to such insulting communications. In short, I suggest that if this matter is to be pursued and I still hope it can be stopped it should be conducted officially, by official representatives of the United States in an open and orderly manner. Unless the administration acts promptly and firmly to stop this volunteer adventure in high diplomacy with the treacherous Castro we may suffer even more humiliating and dangerous consequences than the serious repercussions already apparent.

Certainly the Logan Act was wise, because it was designed to prevent and preclude precisely the sort of thing which we see ventilated today in the U.S. press; the Logan Act was intended to prevent the operation of private negotiations of that sort.

I ask unanimous consent to be printed at this point in the Record some editorials which discuss this transaction.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Huron (S. Dak.) Daily Plainsman]

PAYING TYRANT'S TRIBUTE IS STUPID

"When we start paying tribute to a tyrant," asks Senator THOMAS J. DOOP, Democrat of Connecticut, in the Miami Herald, "are we any longer the land of the brave?"

Another question that might be asked would be: "When we start giving means of further suppression to a tyrant, are we being humanitarians?"

Says South Dakota's own Senator KARL E. MUNDT: "No one challenges the good intentions of the so-called tractor committee, but certainly it must be apparent that little though has been given by this group to the consequences of this reckless activity made in the name of humanitarianism.

"Every American has a right to question whether any consideration was given to the fact that by bowing to the demands of the Cuban dictator we probably would free 1,200 Cubans but at the same time give Fidel Castro the means by which he can tighten his stranglehold on many times the number we

attempt to liberate and condemn them to the slavery of communism."

Falling for Castro's offer is but another example of how many soft-headed, indulgent Americans think they can buy their way out of any sort of trouble.

Of course, there are some big names behind the tractor deal, but America shouldn't be impressed by big names. Ofttimes they're no smarter than the rest of us and sometimes considerably dumber. One classic example is Jack Paar, a man who when he starts solving world problems, has taught millions the virtue of turning off TV sets early and going to bed. He's supporting the tractor deal, but he's been so wrong about Castro lo, these many months, that his advice should be worth exactly what it cost you—and he's not on pay-TV.

[From the Denver Post]

CAN'T SATISFY BLACKMAILER

We regret to see the President of the United States supporting the move by private American citizens to meet Cuban Dictator Fidel Castro's demand for 500 bulldozers in exchange for 1,200 of his prisoners.

Even though we understand the humanitarian motives of the President and the citizens' committee and sympathize with the difficult situation of the young men who wished to liberate their country, we believe the response is a mistake.

For Castro's demand is sheer blackmail; cruel, coldblooded, and characteristic of the forces who oppose us in the cold war.

If 500 bulldozers were all that Castro wanted, it might be wrong to give them to him under the duress of blackmail, but it might at least be defensible as a humane expedient.

But the first payment never satisfies the blackmailer. It merely confirms his judgment of the weakness of his victim, and his demands grow larger and more frightening. And it gives other potential blackmailers food for thought.

[From the Pierre (S. Dak.) Capital Journal]

WRONG KIND OF BULLDOZER

In the name of Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, what in the world is happening to the stamina of the American people?

It was Pinckney, an American Ambassador to the French Republic which had just cut off the heads of its Bourbon royalty, who declared that the American people were prepared to pay "millions for defense, but not 1 cent for tribute."

Pinckney is long since dead but the slogan he provided survived until at least the early decades of this century when one American President sent warships into the harbor of Algiers with the ultimatum of "Pericardis alive or Raisula dead" in response to a demand for ransom, and another American President sent warships into the harbor at Vera Cruz with a demand for an apology for insolence. Unfortunately the spirit behind the slogan seems to have died in the mind of at least some Americans who are advocating meek acceptance of the insolent proposal of Fidel Castro to trade prisoners for bulldozers. We are in favor of sending bulldozers to Cuba, but we are in favor of sending the armored variety commonly referred to as tanks, and of shipping them on landing craft into Guantanamo Bay. We definitely are not in favor of sending a single machine of any kind which could be pointed to as a tribute wrested from a supine American people by the courage and valor of a Communist dictator.

It is time for the American people who harbor the delusion that it is possible to buy peace and friendship from blackmailers to learn that you can't do business with people who are dedicated to your destruction. As

for Castro, he might reflect on the fact that a man named Eichmann, who once proposed to trade prisoners for trucks, is now on trial for his life by a people whom he had sworn

9126

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

June 8

TRACTORS FOR PRISONERS

(Mr. Hiestand (at the request of Mr. Kyl) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. Hiestand. Mr. Speaker, this tractors-for-prisoners blackmail scheme is getting deeper than any mechanized plowshare we might give Fidel Castro to build airstrips and missile bases. The Indianapolis News certainly was properly disturbed when it editorialized:

What in heaven's name goes on here in the home of the free and the land of the brave?

This whole affair has just about reached the last straw and the straw is being snapped over a clear-cut law which has been enacted by this very same Congress of the United States. I am referring to the Logan Act, which prohibits a U.S. citizen from indulging in governmental relations with a foreign country.

The tractors-for-prisoners blackmail has reached precisely that point. The American committee, headed by Walter Reuther, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, and

Milton Eisenhower, reached the point where it—a citizens committee—had set a deadline on the deal and the bearded dictator had better reply. Is this not violating the Logan Act?

But the curtain has not come down on this grim playlet. Castro, who must be as gleeful as the rest of the Communist bloc with his efforts to blackmail the great United States, has now demanded that this tractor committee send representatives to Havana to negotiate. He has even named the representatives he wants, saying, "preferably Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt or Milton Eisenhower."

At any rate, the committee is considering Castro's latest demand and presumably will shuttle off to Cuba to negotiate the ransom plot. This is dangerous meddling by American citizens, a position prohibited under the Logan Act.

I have introduced a resolution, House Resolution 327, asking the House to express its feeling that the tractor committee is violating set law. I hope it receives swift attention—before every petty tyrant threatens blackmail and the State Department gives up its job of handling U.S. foreign policy.

I ask the tractor committee and Members of Congress to read the Logan Act:

Any citizen of the United States, wherever he may be, who, without authority of the United States, directly, or indirectly commences or carries on any correspondence or intercourse with any foreign government or any officer or agent thereof, with intent to influence the measures or conduct of any foreign government or of any officer or agent thereof, in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the United States, shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both.